	II		
1 2 3 4 5	JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO (CSBN 44332) United States Attorney BRIAN STRETCH (CSBN 163973) Chief, Criminal Division DENISE MARIE BARTON (MABN 63405) Assistant United States Attorney 450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055		
6 7 8 9	San Francisco, California 94102 Telephone: (415) 436-7359 Facsimile: (415) 436-7234 denise.barton@usdoj.gov Attorneys for Plaintiff		
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
11	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
12	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION		
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	v. TIMOTHY CRAIG,	CR No. 08-0329 JSW STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER EXCLUDING TIME FROM JUNE 12, 2008 THROUGH JULY 3, 2008	
20	On June 12, 2008, the nextice in this	assa annound hafara the Court and stimulated that	
2122	On June 12, 2008, the parties in this case appeared before the Court and stipulated that		
23	time should be excluded from the Speedy Trial Act calculations from June 12, 2008 through July 3, 2008. The parties represented that granting the continuance was necessary for effective		
24	preparation of counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, to afford counsel		
25			
26	//		
27	//		
28	//		

1	time to address discovery issues and confer regarding a briefing. See 18 II S.C. 8		
	time to address discovery issues and confer regarding a briefing. See 18 U.S.C. §		
2	3161(h)(8)(B)(iv).		
3			
4	SO STIPULATED:		
5			
6	JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO		
7	United States Attorney		
8			
9	DATED: July 3, 2008 /s/ Denise Barton		
10	DATED: July 3, 2008 /s/ Denise Barton DENISE MARIE BARTON Assistant United States Attorney		
	Assistant Office States Attorney		
11			
12	DATED: July 3, 2008 /s/ STEVEN G. KALAR		
13	Attorney for TIMOTHY CRAIG		
14			
15	As the Court found on June 12, 2008, and for the reasons stated above, the Court finds that		
16			
17	the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the		
18	defendant in a speedy trial and that time should be excluded from the Speedy Trial Act		
19	calculations from June 12, 2008 through July 3, 2008. See 18 U.S.C. §3161 (h)(8)(A). The		
20	failure to grant the requested continuance would deny the defendant effective preparation of		
	counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and would result in a miscarriage of		
21	justice. See 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(8)(B)(iv).		
22			
23	SO ORDERED.		
24			
25	DATED: July 7, 2008		
26	HOXORABLE EFFREY S. WHITE		
27	United States District Court Judge		
28			